



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/827,232	04/20/2004	Hsin Mao Hsieh	HSIE3048/EM	2530
23364	7590	11/16/2004	EXAMINER	
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC 625 SLATERS LANE FOURTH FLOOR ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			DUONG, THO V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3743	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/827,232

Applicant(s)

HSIEH, HSIN MAO

Examiner

Tho v Duong

Art Unit

3743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed:
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract exceeds more than 150 words and contains legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "comprising"

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claimed subject matters of "a hot water pipe in continuous bending shape is installed on said pump" is not supported by the specification or the drawings. It does not appear

Art Unit: 3743

in figure 3 that the bending hot water pipe is installed on the pump but rather the hot water pipe is connected to the pump. Furthermore, the limitation of “a fan is installed between said radiating fins and pump and connects to said cold and water pipes” is not supported by the specification and the drawing. It does not appear in the specification and drawings that the fan is connected to the hot and cold water. Regarding claim 5, the limitation of “wherein said fixing part connects to more than one of said supporting parts” is not supported in the specification, it appears in the drawings that one fixing part is connected to one supporting part only.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. As regarding claim 1, the limitation of “a water tank is installed inside said shell body and connects to a cold water pipe and a hot water pipe” renders the scope of the claim indefinite since it is not clear if “a hot water pipe” is the same as “a hot water pipe in continuous bending shape”, which has been previously mentioned or this is another hot water pipe in the system. Claim 1 recites the limitation “the computer case” in line 15. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 4 and 5 recite the limitation “said supporting parts” in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. There is only one “a supporting part” is mentioned in claim 1. Therefore, this “a support part” is not a proper antecedent basic for “said supporting parts”.

Claims 1-4 are further rejected as can be best understood by the examiner, in which, limitation of "more than one of said supporting parts" is understood as more than one sides of the support part.

Claim 5, in view of the 112th first paragraph and second paragraphs issue above, the examiner has not been able to determine whether claim 5 is new or inventive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Koizumi et al. (US 5,323,847). Koizumi discloses (figures 1-5) a water-cool radiator module comprising a shell body including backside of the cabinet (50) having an opening, several radiating holes (53) located on one side of the shell body; a pump (43) is installed inside the shell body, a hot water pipe (41) in continuous bending shape and several radiating fins attached thereon, is connected to the pump (43); a water tank (42) is installed inside the shell body and connects to a cold water pipe (44) and the hot water pipe (41); a fan (45) is installed between the radiating fins and the pump (43); a water head (32) connects to one side of the cold (44) and hot (41) pipes that extending from the shell body; a supporting part (51) is fixed in a slot (a room inside the cabinet (50)) and sticks on the computer case (wall of cabinet (50)); a fixing part (52) is installed on one side the supporting part (51); an opening (56) is installed on the shell body corresponds to the

Art Unit: 3743

radiating holes (53). Regarding claim 2, the supporting part (51) is stuck on one bottom side of the shell body and is stuck on the vertical side of the shell body.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Talbot et al. (US 6,084,774) discloses an apparatus for mounting a circuit board on a system motherboard.

Yu et al. (US 6,362,958) discloses a detachable cooling device for computer.

Shen (US 5,871,396) discloses a convection type heat dissipation device for computers that is adjustable with respect to a heat source.

Owens et al. (US 2003/0169566A1) discloses a plurality of modules attached on a computer casing.

Shih (US 6,763,880) discloses a liquid cooled radiation module for servers.

Lo et al. (US 6,754,077) discloses a heat dissipating apparatus for circuit boards.

Ohashi et al. (US 5,646,824) discloses a cooling system installed inside the laptop.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Tho Duong whose telephone number is (703) 305-0768. The examiner can normally be reached on from 9:30-6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Henry Bennet, can be reached on (703) 308-0101. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 3743

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0861.

A handwritten signature consisting of the letters 'T' and 'D' in a cursive style.

TD

November 15, 2004

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Tho Duong'.

Tho Duong

Patent Examiner.